

On equivalence between maximal and maximum antichains over range-restricted vectors with integral coordinates and the number of such maximal antichains

Shen-Fu Tsai

Received: 2017/01/24

Abstract Consider a strict partially ordered set $\mathcal{P}$ consisting of all d -dimensional vectors with integral coordinates restricted in a certain range. We found that any maximal antichain is also maximum, and the maximum size has a simple expression in terms of the range. Properties of the number of maximal antichains given the range are explored. We present our proof, the application on other areas, and some open questions.

Keywords Ordered Set · $(0-1)$ Matrix · Extremal Problems

1 Introduction

Consider a strict partially ordered set $\mathcal{P}$ consisting of all d -dimensional vectors with integral coordinates restricted in a certain range. The binary relation $<$ is defined as $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d) < \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ if $y_i < x_i$ for every $i \in [1, d]$. Without loss of generality, suppose the range is given by an positive integer vector $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_d)$, meaning that for each dimension i , the coordinate of every vector in $\mathcal{P}$ is restricted to $[1, w_i]$. The number of vectors in $\mathcal{P}$ is $\prod_{i=1}^d w_i$. An *antichain* is a subset of $\mathcal{P}$ such that for any two elements it contains, neither $<$ or its inverse $>$ holds. A *maximal* antichain is an antichain that is not a proper subset of any other antichain. A *maximum* antichain is an antichain that has cardinality at least as large as every other antichain.

If in $\mathcal{P}$ we replace the binary relation $<$ by $\leq$, i.e. $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \leq \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ if $y_i \leq x_i$ for every $i \in [1, d]$, then the size of maximal antichain varies. For example for $\mathbf{w} = (2, 2)$, $\{(1, 1)\}$ is a maximal antichain, and so is $\{(1, 2), (2, 1)\}$. Their sizes differ by 1. On the other hand, under $<$ the only two maximal antichains are $\{(1, 1), (2, 1), (1, 2)\}$ and $\{(2, 2), (2, 1), (1, 2)\}$, both with cardinality 3. The main result of this work is that under $<$, every maximal antichain is also maximum, and the

Shen-Fu Tsai
7319 143rd Ave. NE, Redmond, WA, USA
E-mail: parity@gmail.com

maximal size is $\prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$.

Because we discovered the result while working on the field of matrix exclusion¹, we will present and prove our result using its terminology. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we introduce matrix exclusion terminology and review some literatures. In Section 3 we prove that maximal and maximum antichains are equivalent in our setting. We explore the number of maximal antichains in Section 4. In Section 5 we conclude with some open questions.

2 Matrix exclusion

A matrix is *binary* if each of its entries is either 0 or 1. All the matrices mentioned in this paper are binary. An entry with value 1 is an *one entry*; otherwise it is a *zero entry*. A binary matrix A *contains* another binary matrix P if we can obtain a binary matrix A' with the same dimensionality as P by deleting 0 or more columns and 0 or more rows from A , and $A'_{ij} \geq P_{ij}$ for all i and j . The definition extends naturally to d -dimensional matrix – in each dimension we delete 0 or more indices and form a matrix with the same dimensionality as P . A *avoids* P if A does not contain P . We call P the *forbidden* matrix. In this work we only care about $P = I_{2,d}$, the $2 \times \dots \times 2$ d -dimensional identity matrix.

Definition 1 Let P be a d -dimensional matrix. $ex(\mathbf{w}, P)$ is the maximum number of one entries a $w_1 \times w_2 \times \dots \times w_d$ matrix can have while avoiding P . $ex(n, P) \equiv ex((n, n), P)$, $ex(n, P, d) \equiv ex((n, \dots, n), P)$.

In contrast to our result, the field of matrix exclusion has mostly focused on asymptotic behavior of $ex(\mathbf{w}, P)$, especially in two-dimensional matrices. Bienstock and Gyöni[1] showed $ex(n, P) = \Theta(n\alpha(n))$ for some trapezoidal patterns with four one entries, where $\alpha(n)$ is the extremely slow growing inverse Ackermann function. Füredi and Hajnal[2] raised the question of what matrices have extremal functions linear in n ? Subsequently an array of works emerged to respond to the quest, for example [3, 4, 5, 6]. There are much fewer works on higher dimensional forbidden matrices. Klazar and Marcus[7] showed that $ex(n, P, d) = O(n^{d-1})$ for any $k \times \dots \times k$ permutation matrix P . Geneson and Tian[8] extended the result to all d -dimension tuple permutation matrices.

3 Equivalence between maximal and maximum antichains

For notational simplicity we define *2-contain* same as *contain*, except when $d = 1$ a matrix *2-contains* $I_{2,d}$ as long as it has multiple one entries. Likewise *2-avoid* and $ex_2(\mathbf{w}, P)$ follows naturally from *2-contain* thus defined. The only reason to have *2-contain* defined is to cover the weird but trivial edge case $d = 1$ in the mathematical

¹ After conjecturing and proving the result, the author post them on the forum of CrowdMath Project[9] under username *parityhome*, as the author was originally working on a matrix exclusion game proposed on the forum by moderator Jesse Geneson.

induction used by the proof.

Theorem 1 $\text{ex2}(\mathbf{w}, I_{2,d}) = \prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$. Moreover, every maximal $w_1 \times \dots \times w_d$ matrix that 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$ has exactly $\text{ex2}(\mathbf{w}, I_{2,d})$ one entries. A maximal matrix is one such that flipping any zero to one makes it 2-contain $I_{2,d}$.

Note that $\prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$ is the number of entries with at least one coordinate being 1, and also the number of entries with at least one index i such that $x_i = w_i$.

The result has implication on a matrix exclusion game proposed by Geneson[9]. Played by $m > 1$ players numbered from 0 to $m - 1$, the game starts with a matrix A filled with zero entries. The players take turn to flip a zero in A to one, and a player loses the game if his or her move makes A contain a predefined binary matrix P . Our result implies that if $P = I_{2,d}$, player $[(\prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)) \bmod m]$ always loses no matter what the players' strategies are.

Proof The theorem is trivial when $d = 1$ or $w_i = 1$ for some i in $[1, d]$.

Definition 2 A d -row $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$ of a d -dimensional matrix M is the set of entries with the first $d - 1$ coordinates being $x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}$. There are $\prod_{i=1}^{d-1} w_i$ d -rows, each with w_d entries.

Definition 3 The x_d -th d -cross section is the set of entries with the last coordinate being x_d . There are w_d d -cross sections, each with $\prod_{i=1}^{d-1} w_i$ entries.

Let M be a maximal $w_1 \times \dots \times w_d$ matrix that 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$. We will be primarily dealing with the d -rows of M throughout the proof.

Definition 4 A d -row $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$ is a *ancestor* of d -row $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{d-1})$ if $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y}$. We say $\mathbf{y}$ is a *descendant* of $\mathbf{x}$. $A(\mathbf{x})$ and $D(\mathbf{x})$ are the sets of ancestors and descendants of $\mathbf{x}$, respectively.

Ancestor and descendant relations are transitive, and the graphs of these two relations are directed acyclic. Define $M(\mathbf{x}, x_d) = M_{x_1, \dots, x_d}$.

For a d -row $\mathbf{x}$ define $l(\mathbf{x})$ and $h(\mathbf{x})$ as the minimum and maximum y such that $M(\mathbf{x}, y) = 1$, respectively. They are well defined if there is an one entry in $\mathbf{x}$. For a set of d -rows Z , $l(Z)$ and $h(Z)$ are the smallest and largest d -coordinate of one entries in Z , respectively, with $l(\emptyset) = \infty$ and $h(\emptyset) = -\infty$. For $Z \neq \emptyset$, they are well defined if there exists $\mathbf{z} \in Z$ such that they are well defined for $\mathbf{z}$. We first establish that $h(\cdot)$ and $l(\cdot)$ are well defined everywhere, i.e. every d -row of M has some one entry.

Lemma 1 Every d -row of M has some one entry.

Proof Given a d -row $\mathbf{x}$, if $A(\mathbf{x})$ is empty, then $M(\mathbf{x}, w_d) = 1$. If $D(\mathbf{x})$ is empty, then $M(\mathbf{x}, 1) = 1$. If neither set is empty, since $(1, 1, \dots, 1) \in A(\mathbf{x})$, $l(A(\mathbf{x}))$ is well defined, and so is $h(D(\mathbf{x}))$ as $(w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}) \in D(\mathbf{x})$. We then have $l(A(\mathbf{x})) \geq h(D(\mathbf{x}))$, because otherwise M 2-contains $I_{2,d}$. For any $y \in [h(D(\mathbf{x})), l(A(\mathbf{x}))]$, having $M(\mathbf{x}, y) = 1$ does not make M 2-contain $I_{2,d}$. $\square$

Lemma 2 *Given any d -row $\mathbf{x}$, the set $\{y: M(\mathbf{x}, y) = 1\}$ is a contiguous segment.*

Proof If $M(\mathbf{x}, y_1) = M(\mathbf{x}, y_2) = 1$ for $y_1 \leq y_2$, then setting $M(\mathbf{x}, y) = 1$ for any $y \in [y_1, y_2]$ does not make M 2-contain $I_{2,d}$. $\square$

$w(M)$, the number of one entries in M , is then $\sum_{\mathbf{x}} h(\mathbf{x}) - l(\mathbf{x}) + 1$.

Lemma 3

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \min(w_d, l(A(\mathbf{x}))) \quad (1)$$

Proof It is trivial when $A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, so we only discuss when $A(\mathbf{x})$ is not empty. If $h(\mathbf{x}) > l(\mathbf{z})$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in A(\mathbf{x})$, then M 2-contains $I_{2,d}$. On the other hand, if $h(\mathbf{x}) < l(A(\mathbf{x}))$, setting $M(\mathbf{x}, l(A(\mathbf{x}))) = 1$ does not make M 2-contain $I_{2,d}$. $\square$

Lemma 4

$$l(\mathbf{x}) = \max(1, h(D(\mathbf{x}))) \quad (2)$$

Proof It is trivial when $D(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, so we only discuss when $D(\mathbf{x})$ is not empty. If $l(\mathbf{x}) < h(\mathbf{z})$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in D(\mathbf{x})$, then M 2-contains $I_{2,d}$. On the other hand, if $l(\mathbf{x}) > h(D(\mathbf{x}))$, setting $M(\mathbf{x}, h(D(\mathbf{x}))) = 1$ does not make M 2-contain $I_{2,d}$. $\square$

The two lemmas above imply $l(\mathbf{x}) \leq l(\mathbf{z})$ if $D(\mathbf{x}) \subset D(\mathbf{z})$ and similarly, $h(\mathbf{x}) \leq h(\mathbf{z})$ if $A(\mathbf{z}) \subset A(\mathbf{x})$.

We are now going to prove the theorem by mathematical induction on d and w_d through the following lemmas. Assume the theorem holds for $1, 2, \dots, d-1$ dimensions, and for $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}, 1), (w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}, 2), \dots, (w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}, w_d - 1)$ with d dimensions.

Lemma 5 *Given a matrix M , if $h(\cdot)$ and $l(\cdot)$ are well defined and satisfy Equation 1 and Equation 2 for every d -row $\mathbf{x}$, then M 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$ and is maximal.*

Proof Clearly, if there is an one entry in some d -row $\mathbf{x}$ with d -coordinate y larger than $\min(w_d, l(A(\mathbf{x})))$, then y either goes beyond w_d , which is impossible, or $y > l(\mathbf{z})$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in A(\mathbf{x})$, and M 2-contains $I_{2,d}$. Similarly we could not have one entry in any d -row $\mathbf{x}$ with d -coordinate less than $\max(1, h(D(\mathbf{x})))$.

On the other hand, if all entries in some d -row $\mathbf{x}$ have d -coordinate is smaller than $\min(w_d, l(A(\mathbf{x})))$, setting $M(\mathbf{x}, \min(w_d, l(A(\mathbf{x}))))$ to 1 does not make M 2-contain $I_{2,d}$. The similar argument works for $l(\mathbf{x})$. $\square$

We know that $h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d$ if $A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$. In fact, if the converse is true things are much easier. Let's denote $\{\mathbf{x}: h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d, A(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset\}$ by $X(M)$, a more difficult set of d -rows that we will deal with later.

Definition 5 $X(M) \equiv \{\mathbf{x}: h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d, A(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset\}$

Lemma 6 If $X(M) = \emptyset$, then $w(M) = \prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$.

Proof Transform M to M' by removing the w_d -th d -cross section. Then since $h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d$ if and only if $A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, we have

$$w(M') = w(M) - |\{\mathbf{x}: A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset\}|$$

We claim that M' is still maximal. First, we show that there are still one entry for every d -row in $\{\mathbf{x}: A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset\}$. If $D(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, then $M'(\mathbf{x}, 1) = 1$. If $D(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset$, then since $h(\mathbf{z}) < w_d$ for each $\mathbf{z} \in D(\mathbf{x})$, $l(\mathbf{x}) < w_d$ in M , meaning M' still has one entry in d -row $\mathbf{x}$. So $l(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$ are still well defined in M' . Second, since the only change in $h(\cdot)$ and $l(\cdot)$ is the decrease of $h(\cdot)$ by 1 for $\{\mathbf{x}: A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset\}$, Equation 1 and Equation 2 still hold in M' , and so by Lemma 5, M' is still maximal. By assumption

$$w(M') = w_1 w_2 \dots w_{d-1} (w_d - 1) - (w_1 - 1)(w_2 - 1) \dots (w_{d-1} - 1)(w_d - 2)$$

$A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$ if and only if at least one of the coordinates $x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}$ is 1. So

$$|\{\mathbf{x}: A(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset\}| = w_1 w_2 \dots w_{d-1} - (w_1 - 1)(w_2 - 1) \dots (w_{d-1} - 1)$$

Adding them together, we have

$$w(M) = \prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$$

□

To cope with d -rows in $X(M)$, we will show that we can always convert M to M' which still 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$ maximally, with $|X(M')| < |X(M)|$, and $w(M) = w(M')$. The first step, in Lemma 7, is to find a pair of d -rows $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$ which we could manipulate just a little bit to reduce $|X(\cdot)|$ while keeping maximality and $w(\cdot)$ intact.

We say that a d -row $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$ is a *semi-ancestor* of d -row if $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$.

Lemma 7 If $X(M) \neq \emptyset$, then there are d -rows $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$, such that $\mathbf{x} = (x'_1 + 1, \dots, x'_{d-1} + 1)$, $h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d > l(\mathbf{x})$, and $\mathbf{x}'$ has no other descendant $\mathbf{z}$ with $h(\mathbf{z}) = w_d$.

Proof In the first stage we find a d -row $\mathbf{x}$ with $h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d > l(\mathbf{x})$ and $A(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset$. We start from an arbitrary d -row $\mathbf{x} \in X(M)$. If $l(\mathbf{x}) = w_d$, then there is descendant $\mathbf{z}$ of $\mathbf{x}$ with $h(\mathbf{z}) = w_d$ because the only other possibility is $D(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset$, which leads to $l(\mathbf{x}) = 1$, a contradiction. We set $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{z}$ and see if $l(\mathbf{x}) < w_d$. We repeat the process until we find a $\mathbf{x}$ with $h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d > l(\mathbf{x})$, which is guaranteed to have non-empty ancestor set

$A(\mathbf{x})$. Such $\mathbf{x}$ exists because there are only finite number of d -rows, and whenever we hit one without descendants, $l(\mathbf{x}) = 1 < w_d$. We then set $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1 - 1, \dots, x_{d-1} - 1)$.

In the second stage, if $\mathbf{x}'$ has no other descendant $\mathbf{z}$ with $h(\mathbf{z}) = w_d$ then we are done. If it does, then since $D(\mathbf{z}) \subset D(\mathbf{x})$, $l(\mathbf{z}) \leq l(\mathbf{x}) < w_d$, i.e. $\mathbf{z}$ qualifies the requirement for $\mathbf{x}$ too. Moreover $\mathbf{x}$ is a semi-ancestor of $\mathbf{z}$, so we set $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1 - 1, \dots, x_{d-1} - 1)$. We repeat the process until $\mathbf{x}'$ has no other descendant $\mathbf{z}$ with $h(\mathbf{z}) = w_d$. This process terminates because in the sequence of $\mathbf{x}$ we found, each element is a semi-ancestor of the subsequent element, and this sequence could not be infinitely long. $\square$

Lemma 8 *If $X(M) \neq \emptyset$, we can convert M to another maximal matrix M' that 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$ with $|X(M')| < |X(M)|$ and $w(M') = w(M)$.*

Proof By Lemma 7, we find d -rows $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$ such that $\mathbf{x} = (x'_1 + 1, \dots, x'_{d-1} + 1)$, $h(\mathbf{x}) = w_d > l(\mathbf{x})$, and $\mathbf{x}'$ has no other descendant $\mathbf{z}$ with $h(\mathbf{z}) = w_d$. Construct M' identical to M except $h'(\mathbf{x}) = w_d - 1$ and $l'(\mathbf{x}') = w_d - 1$. We have $X(M') = X(M) - \mathbf{x}$ and $w(M') = w(M)$.

We claim that M' is still a maximal matrix that 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$. The only change we make is to decrease $h(\mathbf{x})$ and $l(\mathbf{x}')$ by 1. Clearly Equation 1 is not violated by M' , because $\mathbf{x}'$ is an ancestor of $\mathbf{x}$. The only possibility that M' violates Equation 2 is that $\mathbf{x}'$ has another descendant $\mathbf{z}$ with $h(\mathbf{z}) = w_d$. But this is impossible because of the choice we make with $\mathbf{x}'$. $\square$

Finally, given any matrix M that maximally 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$, if necessary by applying Lemma 8 a finite number of times we can convert it to another maximal M' with the same number of one entries, still 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$, and with $X(M') = \emptyset$. Then by Lemma 6 we have $w(M) = w(M') = \prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$. This concludes our proof. $\square$

4 Number of maximal antichains

After proving the equivalence of such maximal and maximum antichains, it is natural to ask how many maximal antichains there are given range vector $\mathbf{w}$. In this section we explore this quantity.

Definition 6 $R(\mathbf{w})$ is set of maximal antichains over range-restricted vectors with integral coordinates bounded by $\mathbf{w}$. Theorem 1 says that each element of $R(\mathbf{w})$ has size $\prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$.

For $\mathbf{w}$ with length 2, $|R(\mathbf{w})|$ can be expressed in binomial coefficient.

Lemma 9 $|R([w_1, w_2])| = \binom{w_1 + w_2 - 2}{w_1 - 1}$

We found a property of $|R(\mathbf{w})|$ when $\mathbf{w}$ contains a 2.

Lemma 10 $|R([\mathbf{w}, 2])| = |R(\mathbf{w})|$

Proof We will show that there is bijective mapping $f : R(\mathbf{w}) \rightarrow R([\mathbf{w}, 2])$. Denote the length of vector $[\mathbf{w}, 2]$ by d . For a matrix M with dimension $w_1 \times \dots \times w_{d-1} \times 2$, define $S_{i,j}$ as the set of its d -rows $\mathbf{x}$ with $M(\mathbf{x}, y) = 1$ if and only if $i \leq y \leq j$.

For a matrix $M \in R([\mathbf{w}, 2])$, by Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 its d -rows are partitioned into disjoint sets $S_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 2$. We claim that $S_{1,2} \in R(\mathbf{w})$. This is because

$$w(M) = 2|S_{1,2}| + |S_{1,1}| + |S_{2,2}| = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} w_i + |S_{1,2}|$$

Maximization of $w(M)$ is equivalent to maximization of $|S_{1,2}|$, which by definition leads to $S_{1,2} \in R(\mathbf{w})$.

The following describes an injective f . For a matrix $N \in R(\mathbf{w})$, we form a matrix M by setting $S_{1,2} = N$ and $S_{1,1} = S_{2,2} = \emptyset$. Next, whenever there is a d -row $\mathbf{x} \notin N$ not in $S_{1,1}$ nor $S_{2,2}$, we place it in either of them so that M still 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$. Note that $\mathbf{x}$ could not be both the ancestor and descendant of some d -rows in N , because otherwise N 2-contains $I_{2,d-1}$. Also, $\mathbf{x}$ must be either an ancestor or descendant of some d -row in N , as otherwise $N + \mathbf{x}$ is a larger set that 2-avoids $I_{2,d-1}$. Hence we can always determine whether a d -row $\mathbf{x} \notin N$ should be in $S_{1,1}$ or $S_{2,2}$. Apparently when we are done M is a maximal matrix that 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$.

f is surjective because we have established that given a matrix $M \in R([\mathbf{w}, 2])$, $S_{1,2} \in R(\mathbf{w})$. $\square$

A corollary follows immediately.

Corollary 1 *If $\max_i w_i \leq 2$, then $|R(\mathbf{w})| = \min_i w_i$.*

5 Open questions

Given the simple expression $\prod_{i=1}^d w_i - \prod_{i=1}^d (w_i - 1)$, it is natural to ask if our result can be proved with simpler method, especially without the technical and tricky maneuvers in Lemma 7 and 8. Also, is there a better and perhaps more intuitive way than Equation 1 and Equation 2 to characterize a maximal matrix that 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$? One of the motivations of pursuing an alternative characterization is to derive the expression more general than Section 4 for the number of maximal matrices M that 2-avoids $I_{2,d}$ in terms of range $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_d)$.

References

1. D. Bienstock, E. Györi, An extremal problem on sparse 0-1 matrices, SIAM J. Discrete Math. 4 (1991) 17-27.
2. Z. Füredi, P. Hajnal, Davenport-Schinzel theory of matrices, Discrete Math. 103 (1992) 233-251.
3. R. Fulek, Linear bound on extremal functions of some forbidden patterns in 0-1 matrices, Discrete Math. 309 (6) (2009) 1736-1739.

4. G. Tardos, On 0-1 matrices and small excluded submatrices, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 111 (2005) 266-288.
5. B. Keszegh, On linear forbidden matrices, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 116 (1) (2009) 232-241.
6. J.T. Geneson, Extremal functions of forbidden double permutation matrices, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 116 (7) (2009), 1235-1244.
7. M. Klazar and A. Marcus, Extensions of the linear bound in the Furedi-Hajnal conjecture, *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 38 (2) (2007), 258-266.
8. Jesse T. Geneson and Peter M. Tian, Extremal Functions of Forbidden Multidimensional Matrices, *CoRR*, abs/1506.03874, (2015).
9. <http://www.artofproblemsolving.com/polymath/mitprimes2016/f>

